

No. 23-15285

---

---

IN THE  
**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Ninth Circuit**

---

IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION  
MARY CARR, ET AL. v. GOOGLE LLC, ET AL.

---

Interlocutory Appeal from the  
United States District Court for the Northern District of California  
No. 21-md-2981; No. 20-cv-5761  
District Judge James Donato

---

**APPELLANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO  
VOLUNTARILY DISMISS UNDER FEDERAL RULE  
OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 42(b)**

---

Katherine B. Wellington  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
125 High St., Suite 2010  
Boston, MA 02110

Neal Kumar Katyal  
Jessica L. Ellsworth  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Facsimile: (202) 637-5910  
neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Defendants-Appellants*

September 18, 2023

---

---

*(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)*

## CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1(a), Defendants-Appellants state as follows:

Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company holds more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Payment Corp. is a subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company holds more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Commerce Ltd. is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Ireland Limited is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc.,

a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal  
Neal Kumar Katyal

This case is an interlocutory appeal of a class certification order. Two weeks prior to the September 11, 2023, scheduled oral argument in this case, the District Court issued an order granting Google's motion to exclude from trial the precise injury and damages model on which the class certification order was based. ECF 588.<sup>1</sup> The District Court also issued a second order at the same time addressing decertification, in which it stated that it would vacate the class certification order but lacked jurisdiction to do so because of the pending appeal. ECF 589. Google therefore requested from this Court a limited remand for the purpose of allowing the District Court to vacate the certification order. This Court granted Google's motion and issued a limited remand. CA9 ECF 123 at 3.

The District Court has now entered an order formally vacating the class certification order. Exhibit 1, ECF 604 at 1 ("The order granting certification is consequently vacated, and the consumer class is decertified."). Because the District Court's decertification order moots this interlocutory appeal of the class certification, Google has consulted with counsel for Plaintiffs, and the parties agree to voluntary dismissal of this appeal under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b). The parties agree that each side shall bear its own costs and court fees in connection with this appeal, and all fees due to the Court have been paid.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise specified, ECF references are to the multidistrict litigation docket, No. 3:21-md-02981-JD (N.D. Cal.).

Google has previously filed a motion to maintain the seal in this Court on small amounts of material in the Appellees' response brief and excerpts of record. CA9 ECF 117. That motion remains pending. Although the appeal itself is moot, Google's request to maintain the seal on specific, limited materials filed in this Court is not. Those highly sensitive, confidential materials should not be made public, and this Court should thus issue a ruling on Google's motion to maintain the seal on those materials. Plaintiffs did not file an opposition to Google's sealing motion, and the public's interest in disclosure of the information involved in Google's motion is further diminished now that there no live controversy remains on the merits.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, Google respectfully seeks the following relief:

First, Google requests that the Court grant its pending motion to seal certain information contained in Appellees' response brief and supplemental excerpts of record. CA9 ECF 117.

Second, Google requests that the Court enter an order dismissing this appeal as provided by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b).

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that this Court grant its pending motion to seal and then enter an order dismissing this appeal.

---

<sup>2</sup> After this Court's remand order, the parties announced that they have reached an agreement in principle to settle this case.

Respectfully submitted,

September 18, 2023

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal

Katherine B. Wellington  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
125 High St., Suite 2010  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 702-7745  
Facsimile: (617) 371-1037  
katherine.wellington@hoganlovells.com

Brian C. Rocca  
Sujal J. Shah  
Michelle Park Chiu  
Minna Lo Naranjo  
Rishi P. Satia  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000  
Facsimile: (415) 422-1001  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com

Richard S. Taffet  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
Telephone: (212) 309-6000  
Facsimile: (212) 309-6001  
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com

Neal Kumar Katyal  
Jessica L. Ellsworth  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Facsimile: (202) 637-5910  
neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

Kyle W. Mach  
Justin P. Raphael  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty  
MUNGER, TOLLES, & OLSON LLP  
560 Mission Street  
Twenty Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
kyle.mach@mto.com

Glenn D. Pomerantz  
Kuruvilla Olasa  
MUNGER, TOLLES, & OLSON LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue  
Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com

*Counsel for Defendants-Appellants*

**RULE 27-1(2) STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Circuit Rule 27-1(2), Google has conferred with opposing counsel to determine their position on this motion. Plaintiffs do not oppose the relief requested in this motion.

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This motion complies with the type-volume limitations of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2)(A) and 9th Circuit Rule 27-1 because it contains 465 words, excluding the parts of the motion exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(a)(2)(B).

This motion complies with the typeface and typestyle requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(1)(E) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word for Office 365 in Times New Roman 14-point font.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal  
Neal Kumar Katyal

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on September 18, 2023, the foregoing was electronically filed through this Court's CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of filing to all registered users.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal  
Neal Kumar Katyal

## **EXHIBIT 1**

1  
2  
3  
4 IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE  
5 ANTITRUST LITIGATION  
6  
7  
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
MDL Case No. [21-md-02981-JD](#)  
Member Case No. 20-cv-05761-JD

9  
10  
11  
**ORDER RE DECERTIFICATION OF  
CONSUMER CLASS**

12 In the consumer plaintiffs' case, *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, Case  
13 No. 20-cv-05761-JD, the Court certified a class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3),  
14 and denied Google's motion to exclude Dr. Singer's testimony under Federal Rule of Evidence  
15 702. Dkt. No. 383. This was because the record at the certification stage supported those  
16 decisions. *See id.*

17 That is no longer the case. Based on new developments in the record, the Court has now  
18 excluded Dr. Singer's pass-through formula and his opinions based on the application of that  
19 formula in this litigation. *See* Dkt. No. 588.

20 The same pass-through formula was an essential element of the consumer plaintiffs'  
21 argument in support of certification. *See* Dkt. No. 383. The order granting certification is  
22 consequently vacated, and the consumer class is decertified. *See City of Los Angeles, Harbor*  
23 *Division v. Santa Monica Baykeeper*, 254 F.3d 882, 885 (9th Cir. 2001). The parties' associated  
24 sealing motion, Dkt. No. 324, is terminated as moot.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: September 13, 2023

27  
28  
  
JAMES DONATO  
United States District Judge